



(U) Guidance for 2004 P3 Ratings

FROM: MG Richard Quirk, USA
Signals Intelligence Director
Run Date: 01/06/2005

Raters to give honest evaluations, avoid "rating inflation" (U//FOUO)

(U//FOUO) As we are in the midst of the 2004 Personal Performance Process (P3) closeout, I'd like to take a moment to review the rating guidelines that I expect to be followed throughout SID. In creating our 2004 P3's, our goal was to show direct linkage at all levels to our implementation plan for the NSA corporate strategy. Our leadership responsibility to the SIGINT workforce is to use the P3 process to hold our people accountable and provide a mechanism for continual improvement. My thanks to all of you for your support.

(U//FOUO) Now I need your help in another area. In order for performance plans and evaluations to have the desired effect, we must all use the same general rating guidelines. The 2004 P3 cycle closing date is fast approaching, and it's worth taking the time to put the guidelines on the record again. The Agency's P3 ratings scale is:

- **4.60 - 5.00 Greatly Exceeded Objectives**
(Considerably surpassed goals. Performance objectives were achieved with maximum impact. Unprecedented or overwhelming success. Superior performance. Eligible for WGIs, Promotion, QSIs, and Cash Awards.)
- **3.60 - 4.59 Exceeded Objectives**
(Surpassed goals. Achieved results well beyond expectations. Excellent performance. Eligible for WGIs, Promotion, QSIs, and Cash Awards.)
- **2.60 - 3.59 Met Objectives**
(Consistently achieved goals. Met and occasionally went beyond expectations. Solid performance. Eligible for WGIs, QSIs, Promotion, and Cash Awards.)
- **1.60 - 2.59 Occasionally Met Objectives**
(Sometimes achieved goals. Performance was less than needed to fully meet objectives. Supervisor involvement is needed.)
- **1.00 - 1.59 Did Not Meet Objectives**
(Did not achieve goals. Performed below expectations; performance adversely affected organizational effectiveness. A Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) is required.)

Source: ([http: \[REDACTED\]](http://[REDACTED])).

(U//FOUO) These guidelines require accountability of all of us to make them relevant and effective. We must have an honest dialogue between leaders and their workforce. It begins with clearly articulated performance expectations and a frank assessment of performance coupled with clear steps to be taken to elevate performance. We all know past performance management systems have been less successful than they could have been, not because they were fatally flawed, but because we didn't implement them with rigor and discipline. Rating inflation was a key problem... everyone exceeded expectations, and somehow meeting expectations was viewed as "bad performance appraisal." To sustain a fair promotion and awards program, an honest performance evaluation process is a necessary prerequisite.

(U//FOUO) That said, I want to make sure a few things are completely clear. While I'm discouraging inflated ratings that mean nothing, I'm not imposing any artificial limits, either. What I am committed to is that managers will be held accountable to their workforce for honest evaluations, meaningful guidance and adherence to the Agency's P3 rating policy.

(U//FOUO) As always, I welcome your comments and feedback.

"(U//FOUO) SIDtoday articles may not be republished or reposted outside NSANet without the consent of S0121 ([DLsid.comms](#))."

DYNAMIC PAGE -- HIGHEST POSSIBLE CLASSIFICATION IS
TOP SECRET // SI / TK // REL TO USA AUS CAN GBR NZL
DERIVED FROM: NSA/CSSM 1-52, DATED 08 JAN 2007 DECLASSIFY ON: 20320108